

### **III. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is a response to the Office Action of June 21, 2004. Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12 and 19 are independent claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner further rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 12 and 19 are amended, and Claims 1-5 and 7-20 remain pending in the application.

#### **A. Changes to the Specification**

The specification has been amended to correct a misspelling included in an earlier amendment to the specification. As with the earlier amendment to the specification, no new matter is added.

#### **B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph**

The Examiner has stated that the term "reducing a text-to-speech phonetics set" of independent claim 1 (and, Applicant assumes, the variation "reduced text-to-speech phonetics set" of independent claims 12 and 19) is insufficiently supported by the specification to enable a person of ordinary skill to make and use the invention.<sup>1</sup> Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and directs the Examiner's attention to the specification at amended p. 12 and to Figure 6 as amended, wherein the process of reducing a maximal text-to-speech phonetics set is disclosed. Specifically, Figure 6 shows that a combination of phonemes, allophones, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action, paper no. 13, at p. 2.

gemination may be removed from a maximal phonetics set, thereby creating a reduced text-to-speech phonetics set.

Furthermore, Applicant notes that in the previous Office Action, Examiner indicated that "dependent claims 6 and 7 contain allowable subject matter when combined with independent claim 1."<sup>2</sup> Presumably, the allowable subject matter satisfied the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph, as the Examiner did not mention any lack of enablement in the earlier Office Action. Nonetheless, without waiving any of the above argument or withdrawing the traverse of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph, claims 1, 12, and 19 have been amended to speed their allowance.

**C. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Specifically, Examiner has indicated that the step of reducing a text-to-speech phonetics set may include an internal contradiction. Claim 4 has been amended to remove any potential contradiction.

---

<sup>2</sup> Office Action, paper no. 10, at p. 13.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The claims having been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections, Applicant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph. Applicant further requests reversal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, and asks that the claims promptly be permitted to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Russell O. Paige  
Reg. No. 40,758

Jones Day  
51 Louisiana Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001  
Tel. (202) 879-3939

Dated: September 21, 2004